2002

Improving after-school programs : a literature review

Harriet A. Davis
University of Northern Iowa

Improving after-school programs : a literature review

Abstract

The desire and need for after-school programs in the United States is steadily increasing especially for low- to moderate-income children and adolescents. Studies show after-school program participants watch less television and spend more time in academic activities and enrichment lessons (Posner and Vandell 1994). As a result, these programs are extremely beneficial to children who participate in them. After-school programs also provide a safe haven for countless children who need adult supervision at the end of the regular school day.

The following analysis is a compilation of information derived from scholarly journals, books, organizations participating in after-school programs, Internet sources, and experts in the field. The information provides an overview of important elements of after-school programs, discusses current challenges faced by after-school programs, and provides recommendations for future development. Overall, this review will attempt to answer the question, "What can be done to improve after-school programs?"

This Literature Review by: **Harriet A. Davis**

Titled: **IMPROVING AFTER-SCHOOL PROGRAMS: A LITERATURE REVIEW**

has been approved as meeting the research requirement for the Degree of Masters of Arts in Education.

12/21/02
Date Approved

Lynn E. Nielsen
Graduate Faculty Reader

12/19/02
Date Approved

Gloria Kirkland Holmes
Graduate Faculty Reader

12/20/2002
Date Approved

Rick Traw
Head, Department of
Curriculum and Instruction

IMPROVING AFTER-SCHOOL PROGRAMS: A LITERATURE REVIEW

A Research Paper

Presented to

The Department of Curriculum and Instruction

University of Northern Iowa

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Master of Arts in Education

---

by

Harriet A. Davis

December 2002

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

Introduction
- Significance of the Review....2- 3
- Methodology....3- 4
- Definitions of After-School Programs....4- 5

Overview of After-School Programs
- A Brief History....5- 6
- Types of After-School Programs Today....6- 9
- Characteristics of Participants....9-10
- Funding for After-School Programs....10-11
- Staffing of After-School Programs....11-12
- Facilities for After-School Programs....12

Challenges Faced by After-School Programs
- Maintaining Enrollment....13
- Obtaining Knowledgeable Staff....13-14
- Acquiring Adequate Funding....14-15
- Obtaining Adequate Facilities....15-16
- Conducting Adequate Research....16

Recommendations to Improve After-School Programs
- Gain and Keep Interest of Students....16-17
- Attain Knowledgeable Staff....17-18
- Gain More Funding....18-19
- Improve Facilities....19
- Increase Research....19-20

Conclusion....21-22

Appendix A....23

References....24-27

Introduction

Significance of the Review

The desire and need for after-school programs in the United States is steadily increasing especially for low- to moderate-income children and adolescents. After-school programs are but one of many school-age child care (SACC) programs available to parents. In 1990, approximately 8% of all children 5 to 12 years old in the United States were enrolled in such programs (Hofferth, Brayfield, Diech, & Holcomb, 1991).

After-school programs are the fastest growing segment of childcare services (Seligson, Gannett, & Cotlin, 1992). They are joining the family and the school as the third critical developmental setting for low- and moderate-income children, (Halpren, 2002).

After-school programs are in high demand. Studies show after-school program participants watch less television and spend more time in academic activities and enrichment lessons (Posner and Vandell 1994). As a result, these programs are extremely beneficial to children who participate in them. After-school programs also provide a safe haven for countless children who need adult supervision at the end of the regular school day.

Given the important role after-school programs play in the development of children, it is essential that society strive to provide such programs at the highest level of efficiency possible. Many after-school programs are not equipped with the tools for building exemplary programs. Safe and Smart (1998) state, "Many programs allow children to spend far too much time in passive activities such as television or video viewing. Most after-school programs do not have the use of a library, computers,

museum, art room, music room, or game room on a weekly basis. Too many programs do not have access to a playground or park."

This problem is significant and warrants continued research because our children's' future is at stake. A child's experience at an after-school program can easily be life altering. It is up to educators, administrators, policymakers and community members to decide if the experience will help build a positive or negative future for children who participate.

The following analysis is a compilation of information derived from scholarly journals, books, organizations participating in after-school programs, Internet sources, and experts in the field. The information is appropriate because it provides an overview of important elements of after-school programs, it discusses current challenges faced by after-school programs, and it provides recommendations for future development. Overall, this review will attempt to answer the question, "What can be done to improve after-school programs?"

Methodology

The primary methodology used for this review involved searching the ERIC database for journal articles focusing on after-school programs. Other education databases, such as Educational Abstracts, Emerald Library, and Expanded Academic were also searched. Psychology, sociology, communication, science, mathematics, and statistics databases were also used to locate journals and abstracts of importance for this analysis. In addition to databases, Internet sources, organizations supporting after-school programs, and experts in the education field contributed to the resources for the review. Because of their credibility and accessibility these sources were used for this review.

This review includes an analysis and discussion of after-school programs and the factors that may contribute to their improvement. Then recommendations and conclusion are presented followed by a reference list of scholarly sources used to complete the review.

Definitions of After-School Programs

There are many definitions for after school programs. The definition for each program varies based on the goals each sets out to achieve. A representative definition is provided by the National Youth Violence Prevention Resource Center:

> After-school programs are defined as safe, structured activities that convene regularly in the hours after school and offer activities to help children learn new skills, and develop into responsible adults. Activities may cover topics such as technology, reading, math, science and the arts. Programs may also offer new experiences such as community service, internships or tutoring and mentoring opportunities (National Youth Violence Prevention Resource Center, 2001).

An after school program may also be defined as a safe place to spend after school time in association with an organization that reinforces the school curriculum and builds strengths that may not be developed in the school (ERIC Clearinghouse on Urban Education, 1998).

Still another definition for after school programs is a safe, engaging environment that motivates and inspires learning outside of the regular school day (Safe and Smart, 1998). Safe and Smart also state that, "Both practitioners and researchers have found that effective programs combine academic, enrichment, cultural, and recreational activities to guide learning and engage children and youth in wholesome activities."

Although definitions vary with different types of programs, the one aspect all after-school programs have in common is their attempt to provide an adult-supervised, safe haven for children and adolescents.

Overview of After-School Programs

A Brief History

After-school programs began as "boys clubs" in the latter part of the nineteenth century when children's paid labor was on the decline and the number of students enrolling in school was growing (Halpren, 2002). This trend created out-of-school time for children who would otherwise have been working for wages. The out-of-school time exposed children to the "streets" and many negative influences including violence, crime, and a host of illegal activities.

In an effort to eliminate the negative results of out-of-school time, communities searched for ways to occupy children's time. Community reformers believed play to be a critical element of children's lives. It was argued that play was how children learned and made sense of the world (Halpren, 2002).

In 1876, businessman Edward Hariman opened a boy's club with seven initial members (Zane, 1990). By 1900 there were 400 regular members (Halpren, 2002). The club's purpose was to provide recreation and education in after-school hours to help keep children out of trouble. By the turn of the century, churches and other religiously based organizations were also providing after-school programs as were organizations serving specific ethnic groups (Halpren, 2002).

After-school programs were steadily increasing until the Depression years when funding was cut drastically. However, with the onset of World War II, after school

programs began to grow again as more and more mothers took employment outside the home (Halpren, 2000).

In the years following the War, many after-school programs were formed with basically the same objectives, to keep children from undesirable activities, to provide them with academic enrichment, and to offer them "play-time" in a constructive nurturing environment.

Between 1970 and 1990 the number of single-parent families and dual income families increased dramatically. This trend resulted in approximately five million children or three out of every four school-age students being sent home to care for themselves during the hours between the close of school and the end of the typical work day. These children are commonly referred to as "latch key" children. Current estimates of the number of "latch key" children range from 2 to 15 million (National Association of Elementary School Teachers, 1999).

While present-day after-school programs are of significantly higher quality than the programs of years past, they continue to share the same basic goals. With today's after-school programs becoming increasingly diverse and in short supply, two of the most significant challenges include obtaining adequate funding and hiring qualified staff. Maintaining enrollment, obtaining adequate facilities, and conducting needed research are also challenges faced by today's after-school programs.

Types of After-School Programs Today

Many different types of after-school programs are available today. They differ in their themes, their participant type, and their activities. Following are various types of programs and a brief account of their services.

Many programs serve as a safe place for children to have fun. These types generally offer sport activities and enrichment activities and are called recreational programs (Shumow, 2001). Examples of recreational after-school programs are school football, basketball, or soccer team programs where students stay after school and prepare for competition or participation in a sport.

Another example of recreational after school programs would be ones that focus on fitness such as the ideas Dennis Docheff, chair of the Physical Education Department at Central Missouri State University mentions. "There could be great value in an HPERD (Health, Physical Education, Recreation and Dance) professional leading a special fitness club or skills workshops for students after school" (Crawford, 2002).

Yet another example is Health and Wellness Day. This is a one-day recreational after school program to provide health education in the wake of increasing obesity and inactivity in our elementary-age children. This program is offered to elementary students in hopes of providing these services on a more regular basis (Cornely, 2001).

The community-created or community-based types of after school programs usually have their roots in the community. They focus on the needs of the community and they often emphasize recreational, social, or cultural activities (ERIC Clearinghouse on Urban Education, 1998).

Earth Force could be categorized as a community-based program. Earth Force After School is a program that focuses on experimentation with the environment combined with national academic standards. It is funded by the 21st Century Program. " Because one in five students has no adult supervision after school, programs such as

Earth Force After School give them a stimulating, educational way to spend their late afternoons" (Science Activities, 2001).

The other four types of programs are all tied to academic achievement and/or improvement. According to the ERIC Clearinghouse on Urban Education (1998), academic types of after school programs are language arts, study skills, academic subjects, and tutoring.

Language Arts programs focus on improving literacy and language skills. Study Skills programs are for students who don't study or comprehend well. Academic Subjects programs focus on a specific curriculum area, and Tutoring programs match tutors with students to assist them with their schoolwork. A few academic type after-school programs are given as examples.

The after-school programs at Shaker Heights Middle School in Ohio are homework based. Although the school provides extracurricular activities also, their main focus is on the students getting their homework completed.

The four programs they offer are after school academic sessions, the homework center, the homework hotline, and the university tutorial program. The after school academic session is an hour of small group instruction with a schoolteacher the hour before extracurricular activities begin. The homework center is where students can go after the academic sessions to do their homework and/or be assisted with their homework by two staffed teachers. The homework hotline is where students can call to obtain homework assignments in case they are absent or if they misplace their assignments. And the university tutorial program matches university sophomores and juniors with one or two of the middle school students to assist the students who need help in certain subject

areas. The university students also double as role models for the students (Glazer & Williams, 2001).

Some academic after-school programs are theme-based. Students are given a topic and they learn about it in various ways over a period of time. This helps the student make connections with ideas and experiences (Bergstrom & O'Brien, 2001).

There are also technology-rich academic after-school programs such as KLICK! (Kids Learning in Computer Klubhouses!). This program operates in ten middle schools in Michigan and it focuses on increasing learning through the use of computers. The founders chose computer-based activities in part, because the communities they planned to serve lacked access to modern technologies and expertise in technology and academic areas. Its goal is to provide safe and engaging learning opportunities to students during after school hours. The clubhouses are housed in ten middle schools in rural and inner city communities. Along with technology, there is a huge focus on culture (Zhao & Girod, 2000).

The types of after-school programs operating today have a wide range. Some cater to individuals with special needs; others only offer a specific subject, while others only offer extracurricular activities. Many offer a combination of these opportunities. But for the most part, after school programs basically offer academic assistance and physical and mental development while providing a safe place for children, when they would otherwise be home alone.

Characteristics of Participants

Participants of after-school programs are school-age children, usually 5 – 14 years of age in grades kindergarten through eighth. No study was found that showed a

substantial gender difference. Most studies found for this research focus on low-income, urban, minority students, but programs exist for all types of students. Appendix A is a table listing various characteristics of after-school program participants.

Many who attend after-school programs are school-age children and teens that would otherwise be unsupervised during the hours after school or "latch-key" children. "Latch-key" children are children whose parents' are not home when school is out and they stay home alone until the parent returns. Approximately 35 percent of twelve-year old children are left home by themselves while their parents are at work (Safe and Smart, 1998).

Because a major reason for requesting increased after school care is to provide a safe haven for children, the children in the most unsafe neighborhoods stand to benefit to the greatest extent. Children and teens that are unsupervised after school are far more likely to use alcohol, drugs, and tobacco. They are more likely to engage in criminal and other high-risk behaviors, receive poor grades, and drop out of school than those children who have the opportunity to benefit from constructive activities supervised by responsible adults (Safe and Smart, 1998). According to Shumow (2001), "Children from high-risk backgrounds have both the most to gain from after school programs in terms of educational opportunity and the least access to after school programs."

Funding for After School Programs

Many different sponsors fund after school programs. The United States Government is a major supplier of financial assistance for many of these programs.

The 21st CCLC Program is a key component of President Bush's No Child Left Behind Act. It is an opportunity for students and their families to continue to

learn new skills and discover new abilities after the school day has ended. Congress has supported this initiative by appropriating $1 billion for after school programs in Fiscal Year (FY) 2002 (up from $846 million in 2001) (U.S. Department of Education, 2001).

The government also funds other after school programs in addition to the 21st Century Program. Other sponsors include, but are not limited to, local and state school funds, community education departments, non-profit organizations, churches, and private contributions.

The previously mentioned academic after-school program, KLICK! was funded by a grant from the U.S. Department of Education and is supported by the College of Education at Michigan State University (Zhao & Mishra, 2000).

The aforementioned program, Earth Force After School, was funded by a grant from the 21st Century Program (Science Activities, 2001).

The Charles Stewart Mott Foundation is a private investor that has invested $83 million in after-school educational services (Miller, 2001).

Staffing of After School Programs

Staff members of after-school programs range from volunteers to paid personnel. At GearUp, an academic after-school program at Logan Middle School in Waterloo, Iowa, some staff members are college volunteers who are staffed at after-school programs to meet requirements for specific courses. While most of these students major in education, their majors vary. Some major in psychology and others in social work. Most college students serve as tutors or mentors while some are paid personnel who hold

supervisory positions. Again, it varies. Parents and community members also serve as volunteers who do various work for the program.

In other after-school programs there are also teachers on staff. Some are certified teachers and some have not obtained certification. Some of the teachers are volunteers while others are paid for their services. The homework-based program at Shaker Heights Middle School in Ohio is a good example of this type of staff. They employ teachers and administrators, and they also have volunteer tutors from nearby universities who serve on their staff (Glazer & Williams, 2001).

Facilities for After School Programs

After-school programs are usually operated on a school campus for convenience and easy accessibility to educational material. However, some after-school programs are facilitated elsewhere, such as churches, recreation centers, colleges, or libraries.

The Robert Taylor Boys and Girls Club of Chicago is an example of a recreation center that offers after-school care. It is a safe haven for children and it is open from 2 p.m. until after 6 p.m. (Coleman, Lahey, & Orlando, 1999).

The St. Ann's of Morrisania church in New York houses an after-school program for neighborhood children (Kozol, 2000). The Payne Memorial A.M.E. Church of Waterloo, Iowa also runs an after-school program within their church.

Many public libraries throughout the country have developed programs to serve children during after-school hours (Dowd, 1995).

Challenges Faced by After School Programs

Maintaining Enrollment

Maintaining student enrollment in after-school programs is a challenge that administrators continue to struggle with. A student's registration in a program does not guarantee his or her continuance in the program.

The dropout rate among high-risk students in these programs is substantially high. "Eleven out of twelve comparisons between dropouts and stayers indicate that more high-risk student were more likely drop out" (Weisman & Gottfredson, 2001). And "no more than 10 to 15% of low-income children of elementary and middle school age are in regular programs (Halpren, 2000).

McLaughlin, Irby, & Langman (1994) state, "The subgroup of children who regularly attend after school programs generally shrinks in size with increasing age, as children entering their teens are faced with part-time jobs, family responsibilities, and the lure of the streets." A study showed that because students with higher-risk factors drop out more than students who are at lower risk, many after school programs are catering to the needs of the lower-risk students instead of the higher-risk population that they were intended to assist (Weisman & Gottfredson, 2001). After-school programs need to successfully recruit and retain participants.

Obtaining Knowledgeable Staff

The lack of a knowledgeable staff is a disadvantage to any educational program. In after-school programs this problem is epic because so much is involved in staffing enough qualified people to make the program a success. Many qualified persons already teach during the regular school day and therefore may be overwhelmed with an extended

workday. "Principals and staff may already feel overburdened by school reform imperatives to address the needs of our increasingly diverse student population, state and national standards, assessment and evaluation, as well as improved school safety" (National Association of Elementary School Principals, 1999). Also, many qualified persons want to be paid for their services, but low budgets do not allow for this convenience.

The education level of the staff members is generally high school. According to Halpren (2000), the majority of frontline staff either have no more than a high school education. Program coordinators and directors tend to have an associate degree or a bachelor's degree. Public school teachers generally do not participate in after-school programs, but work with in-school programs instead.

There is a large turnover rate in after-school programs, 40 percent according to Miller. Most staff work part-time and some see this as an additional burden to their existing responsibilities. Finding money to pay qualified staff is a major problem in the hiring and training aspects of the after-school programs (Miller, 2001).

Acquiring Adequate Funding

A key problem in developing quality after-school programs is inadequate funding for such programs. Although the United States Department of Education allocated $1 billion for after school programs for the year 2001, the financial requirements for after school programs and their needs double this amount.

The need for programs is far from being met. More than 28 million school-age children have parents who work outside the home, and that number is growing. Applications for after-school program funds from the federal government's 21st

Century Learning Center initiative outpace the resources available by two to one. While the initiative has grown exponentially in the past four years (from $40 million in 1998 to $846 million in 2001), the U.S. Department of Education had to deny 1,000 high-quality proposals for after-school funding in the last grant cycle. This gap reflected a need in 2000 that was more than double the available resources (U.S. Department of Education, 2001).

There are many after school programs presently operating, which are in dire need of improvements, which require funds. Among these needed improvements are facilities, qualified educators, and more research on after-school programs, which are discussed in this segment of the analysis. Funding is needed for these improvements, as well as for the great demand for additional after-school programs in many areas around the United States.

Obtaining Adequate Facilities

Facilities with below standard learning quarters and inadequate space for comfort can be detrimental to an after-school program. The availability of appropriate space is critical to the program, affecting the quality of the program (Grossman, Walker & Raley, 2001).

Although some after-school programs are operated in libraries, churches, or recreation centers, most operate from school-based facilities. Ninety-two percent of voters favor school-based after-school programs in their communities because they view schools as safe, trusted and conveniently located (National Association of Elementary School Principals, 1999).

Facilities for school-based after-school programs are sometimes limited due to lack or sharing between the school staff and the after-school staff (National Association of Elementary School Principals, 1999). Also, after-school programs often have to compete with teachers, sports teams, and other organizations for space, especially the gymnasium or computer labs because traditional classrooms crowded with desks are not suitable for various enrichment activities (Grossman, Walker & Raley, 2001).

Conducting Adequate Research

The demand for after-school programs is steadily increasing, but there still remains little research on the effectiveness of such programs. Over a decade ago in 1990, Widdows & Powell stated that research on after-school child care was in its early stages. Still today, adequate research remains a challenge for after-school programs. Experts note that program evaluation by after school program participants would be essential to access program quality, but no well-developed evaluation scale has been found to properly measure results (Zhang, et al., 2001). Some existing research is controversial due to the populations studied. To date, research to determine which types of programs work best with urban youth has been limited (ERIC Clearinghouse on Urban Education, 1998).

Recommendations to Improve After School Programs

Gain and Keep Interest of Students

Despite the focus on after-school programs, only sixteen percent of students age 6-12 attend after-school programs on a regular basis (Capizzano, Tout, & Adams, 2000). To get students to enroll in an after school program, one has to evoke their attention. Advertising via mediums or face-to-face persuasion can be done, but it must be in a

manner that gets their attention. Schwartz (1996) lists personal contact with parents, luring kids with the offering of sports and fun activities, and providing them with a safe place to go after school as ways to get their attention. Another lists having registration in public housing and low-income apartment units along with personal contact with parents (Grossman, Walker, & Raley, 2001).

A just as difficult or maybe more difficult task is keeping the students' attention and interests once they have joined the program. What will keep the kids from getting bored and from choosing other interests over after school program activities? To attract teens in hopes of keeping them enrolled, one middle school program charged an activity fee to build commitment to attend, while others included participating in special events outside of school as an incentive. Giving teens more flexibility and more autonomy kept their interest, as did programs that focused on job readiness and placement (Grossman, Walker & Raley 2001).

Attain Knowledgeable Staff

The best way to attain a knowledgeable and highly effective staff would be to offer decent pay to educators who qualify to work in various teaching arenas. But since adequate funding is not available for such an offer, other sources have to be tapped. A great way to gain knowledge about the needs and wants of the kids in the programs is to form a good network between the after school program staff and the regular school staff. Miller (2001), made this comment on after-school programming:

> No matter what forms the programs take, to reach their potential for supporting student learning, staff of high quality after-school programs need to develop strong connections to schools. They need to understand the mission of the school,

the expectations of students at each grade level, and the research on learning, and they must be willing to share in accountability for a range of results.

South Carolina runs a Teacher Cadet Program derived from The Federal Work Study Program. It enlists middle and high school reading and math tutors to tutor in after school programs (U.S. Department of Education, 1999). This is a great way to inspire future educators as well as include peer teaching and learning in the program.

Yet another source of gaining more knowledge for your staff is the parents of the students. Get well acquainted with them to learn more about their children. It is very important to include parents in the program to assist with their children and to give ideas that might help in a program's success. This is especially important for programs offering cultural and recreational activities (ERIC Clearinghouse on Urban Education, 1998). Attempt to involve the parents in any way possible.

Gain More Funding

With so much financial assistance needed to run after-school programs and with such a great demand for even more programs, adequate funding has become possibly the greatest challenge for after school programs. A continuing account showing that these programs result in positive changes for the participants is needed for continued funding. Miller (2001) says after-school programs must meet the public's rising expectations in order to continue or increase funding.

Another source of funding is individual families. Solicitations, fund-raisers, and public awareness campaigns can bring in funds for programs.

Still another outlet for funding is tapping into existing sources, such as university funds set aside for such programs. Title I funding is also an existing source that may be used for child care services (Miller, 2001).

Improve Facilities

The condition of the facilities for after-school programs must improve if children are to get the full benefit of the program. As Grossman, Walker & Raley (2001), stated, spacing and resources for the activities of the programs affects the quality of the programs.

Of course, lack of funds is a major reason for this problem and funding needs to be increased to better facilitate after-school programs. In addition to funding woes, standard facilities is often times overlooked as a pertinent component of a successful after-school program. A survey revealed that only 48% of before- and after-school programs had space dedicated to their programs (Halpren, 1999).

More research needs to be presented to show the impact that adequate facilities or lack thereof has on one's ability to experience a transfer of learning.

Increase Research of After-School Programs

The more credible research done to prove the need for after school programs, the greater the chances are to receive increased funding. Miller (2001) gives the following quote regarding research for after-school programs:

> As programs multiply, we need more information about what works, how, and for whom. Program evaluations and studies linking positive outcomes to after-school program participation are not enough. We need to know what outcome links are linked to what program models; what approaches are most successful for students

of varied ages, interests, needs and backgrounds; and what staff development activities and working conditions promote the strong relationships between staff and students that are crucial to student resiliency. Finally, we need to examine the ways in which active and informal learning environments can support enhanced cognitive outcomes and social emotional competence.

As noted earlier, not enough research proving the necessity for after school programs is available. Research should imply that our children's survival depends upon after school programs. Adequate research is a key component for acquiring much needed funds for after-school programs.

Conclusion

There is an overwhelming demand for more after-school programs in all parts of the United States. Not only are the programs needed, but they also need to be successful by achieving their set goals.

With so many different types of after school programs operating today, the goals for each vary with the individual objectives of their particular program. But of the studies researched, the vast majority of them have these goals in common:

- To provide a safe haven for school-age children during after school hours when their parents are not available to supervise them.
- To enhance student academic achievement.
- To promote positive youth development into adulthood.

Any additional goals usually contribute to achieving the ones above.

The presented analysis supplied:

- Definitions of after-school programs
- A brief history of after-school programs
- Different types of after-school programs
- Challenges faced by after-school programs
- Recommendations for solutions to after-school program challenges

This literature review is an attempt to inspire improvement of after-school programs to the point that they are of the highest quality. That is to a point where they possess all of the elements, listed by Safe and Smart (1998), needed to be an exemplary after-school program. These elements are:

- Goal setting and strong management

- Quality after-school staffing
- Low staff/student ratios
- Attention to safety, health, and nutrition issues
- Effective partnerships with community-based organizations, juvenile agencies, law enforcement, and youth groups
- Strong involvement of families
- Coordinating learning with the regular school day
- Linkages between school-day teachers and after-school personnel
- Evaluation of program progress effectiveness

Careful planning and much attention to detail must be exercised in order to compose an exemplary after-school program, but it can be done and our children are counting on us to safeguard and enhance their futures.

APPENDIX A

Percentage of children in grades K-8 who received various types of care before or after school, by selected characteristics: 1999

Student characteristic	Received care from relative[1]			Received care from nonrelative[1]			Attended center-based program			Child cared for self			Parental care		
	Total	K–5	6–8	Total	K–5	6–8	Total	K–5	6–8	Total	K–5	6–8	Total	K–5	6–8
Total	19.4	21.1	15.9	7.5	9.6	3.1	18.5	20.3	14.8	11.6	4.8	25.6	51.8	52.4	50.5
Race/ethnicity															
White	16.5	18.1	13.2	7.8	10.2	2.9	16.5	18.8	11.8	11.7	4.2	27.0	54.6	55.3	53.1
Black	28.0	29.5	24.7	7.0	8.2	4.2	27.8	29.0	25.2	12.5	6.3	26.1	40.0	40.6	38.6
Hispanic	21.4	22.9	18.1	6.8	8.6	2.7	15.8	16.2	15.1	9.5	4.6	20.7	54.0	54.8	52.2
Other	22.1	24.7	16.7	7.6	9.7	3.3	21.1	22.2	19.0	12.3	8.0	20.6	48.0	47.0	[4]49.9
Household income															
$10,000 or less	22.5	24.6	17.3	7.0	8.6	3.2	18.9	19.5	17.5	10.9	6.5	21.8	51.6	50.8	53.5
$10,001–20,000	26.1	28.0	22.1	6.8	9.0	2.0	18.0	18.3	17.4	11.6	6.1	23.2	47.8	48.2	46.9
$20,001–35,000	21.2	22.5	18.2	7.7	9.7	3.5	19.0	20.5	15.8	11.3	4.9	24.9	50.5	51.4	48.4
$35,001–50,000	18.9	21.3	14.5	6.4	8.4	2.7	16.2	17.2	14.5	11.6	3.8	26.4	53.8	55.4	50.8
More than $50,000	14.8	15.9	12.5	8.3	10.8	3.5	19.3	22.7	12.5	12.0	4.0	27.7	53.1	53.8	51.9
Parents' highest education level															
Less than high school	19.0	20.6	15.9	5.1	6.8	2.1	15.2	16.1	13.4	11.2	6.2	20.3	57.9	58.0	57.7
High school diploma or equivalent	24.4	26.3	20.5	6.7	8.7	2.5	17.5	18.5	15.3	12.1	5.2	26.6	48.8	50.0	46.2
Some college, including vocational/technical	22.0	24.2	17.2	8.9	11.1	4.3	19.5	21.2	15.8	12.0	5.3	26.2	47.8	48.0	47.2
Bachelor's degree	13.9	14.7	12.0	7.3	9.2	2.9	19.4	21.8	13.9	10.2	3.3	25.7	56.5	57.2	54.9
Graduate/professional degree	11.5	12.5	9.5	7.7	10.2	3.0	19.2	22.1	13.6	11.4	3.9	25.7	56.4	57.0	55.4
Poverty status[2]															
Poor	23.2	25.2	18.4	6.1	7.6	2.6	18.3	18.3	18.1	10.0	5.6	20.0	52.5	52.3	53.1
Nonpoor	18.3	19.8	15.2	7.9	10.2	3.3	18.5	20.8	13.9	12.1	4.6	27.1	51.6	52.4	49.8
Family structure															
Two biological/adoptive parents	13.3	14.7	10.3	6.5	8.4	2.4	15.9	16.8	13.9	9.1	3.3	21.9	60.6	61.7	58.2
One biological/adoptive parent	30.3	32.6	25.3	9.7	12.1	4.5	23.0	26.7	15.2	15.1	7.3	31.5	36.2	35.4	38.1
One biological/adoptive and one stepparent	20.1	21.8	17.5	7.4	10.2	3.2	18.6	21.6	14.0	13.9	4.6	27.9	48.6	48.8	48.4
Other relatives	17.6	21.3	9.3	4.2	4.5	3.6	21.0	16.3	[3]31.4	11.9	7.0	[3]22.8	55.6	59.1	[4]47.9
Step- or foster parents	[3]19.0	[3]16.7	[3]21.5	[3]3.2	[3]6.1	[3]0.0	[3]15.0	[3]20.2	[3]9.4	[3]14.3	[3]7.9	[3]21.0	[3]56.3	[3]57.0	[3]55.5

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, NCES. National Household Education Surveys Program (NHES), 1999 (Parent Interview Survey).

References

After-school programs in environment action. *Science Activities*, (2001, Summer) 38, 43.

Bergstrom, J.M., & O'Brien, L.A. (2001). Themes of discovery. *Educational Leadership*, 58, 29-33.

Capizzano, J., Tout, K., & Adams, G. (2000). Child care patterns of school-age children with employed mothers. Washington, DC: The Urban Institute.

Coleman, P.J., Lahey, E., & Orlando, K. (1999). The Robert Taylor boys and girls club of Chicago. Practitioner Perspectives: Bulletin from the field. *Department of Justice* (abstract). Washington, D.C.: Bureau of Justice Assistance.

Cornely, H., Behar, R., Dillon, H., Espinal, R., Othon, J., Patten, M., et al. (2001). Health and wellness day: Health promotion in after-school care. *Physical Therapy*, 81, A38.

Crawford, S. (2002). Should HPERD professionals be involved in after-school Programs? *The Journal of Physical Education, Recreation & Dance*, 73, 15-17.

Dowd, F. (1995). Public library programs for latchkey children: A status report. *Public Libraries*, 34(5), 291-295.

Glazer, N.T., & Williams S. (2001). Averting the homework crisis. *Educational Leadership*, 58, 43-45.

Grossman, J.B., Walker, K. & Raley, R. (2001). Challenges and opportunities in after-school programs: Lessons for policymakers and funders. Manpower Demonstration Research Corporation: New York.

Halpren, R. (1999). After-school programs for low-income children: Promise and challenges. *The Future of Children*, 9, 81-95.

Halpren, R. (2000). The promise of after-school programs for low-income children. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly*, 15, 185-214.

Halpren, R. (2002). A different kind of child development institution: the history of after-school programs for low-income children. *Teachers College Record*, 104, 178-211.

Hofferth, S.L., Brayfield, A., Deich, S., & Holcomb, P. (1991). *National child care survey*, 1990. Washington, DC. Urban Institute Press.

Kozol, J. (2000). *Ordinary resurrections*. New York: Random House.

McLaughlin, M., Irby, M., & Langman, J. (1994). *Urban sanctuaries: Neighborhood organizations in the lives and futures of inner-city youth.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Miller, B.M. (2001). The promise of after-school programs. *Educational Leadership*, 58, 6-12.

National Association of Elementary School Principals, Reston, VA (1999). *After-school programs & the k-8 Principal: Standards for quality school-age child care. Revised Edition.*

National Youth Violence Prevention Resource Center (2001). Overview of After-School Programs. (n.d.). Retrieved October 3, 2002, from http://www.safeyouth.org/topics/afterschool.htm

Posner, J.K., & Vandell, D.L. (1994). Low income children's after-school care: Are there beneficial effects of after-school programs? *Child Development*, 65,

440-456.

Roffman, J.G., Pagano, M.E., & Hirsch, B.J. (2001). Youth functioning and experiences in inner-city after-school programs among age, gender, and race groups. *Journal of Child and Family Studies*, 10, 85-100.

Safe and Smart. (1998). Making after school hours work for kids. U.S. Department of Education, (ch. 1-2).

Seligson, M., Gannett, E., & Cotlin, L. (1992). Before-and after-school child care for elementary school children. In B. Spodek & O.N. Saracho (Eds.), *Issues in Child Care* (pp. 125-142). New York: Teachers College Press.

Shumow, L. (2001). Academic effects of after-school programs. *ERIC Digest*, November, 2001.

Swartz, W. (1996). After-school programs for urban youth. *ERIC/CUE Digest*, 114.

Urban after-school programs: Evaluations and recommendations. (1998, December) *ERIC Clearinghouse on Urban Education Digest*, 140.

U.S. Department of Education (1999). Teacher recruitment and training in after-school Programs. (1999, Summer) *Bringing Education to After-School Programs.*

U.S. Department of Education (2001). President Bush's No Child Left Behind Act. (n.d.). Retrieved October 3, 2002 from http://www.NoChildLeftBehind.gov/

Weisman, S. & Gottfredson, D. (2001). Attrition from after-school programs: Characteristics of students who drop out. *Prevention Science*, 2, 201-205.

Widdows, R. & Powell, D. (1990). Cost and quality factors in parents' choice of after-school care. *Journal of Consumer Affairs*, 24, 381(11).

Zane, S. (1990). *The boys' club of New York: A history*. New York: The Boys' Club

of New York.

Zhang, J., Smith, D., Brimer, J., Rodriguez, A., Ocker, L.B., Killion, L.E., et al. (2001). Participant perceptions of after-school enrichment programs: Development of an evaluation scale. *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport*, 72, A-43.

Zhao, Y., Mishra, P., & Girod, M. (2000). A clubhouse is a clubhouse is a clubhouse. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 16, 287-300.